

**FREMONT SCHOOL DISTRICT
FREMONT BUDGET COMMITTEE
Joint Meeting
December 8, 2007
8:15 A.M. Budget Committee Work Session
9:00 A.M. Joint Board Session
Fremont Town Hall
295 Main Street ~ Fremont, NH 03044**

MINUTES APPROVED 01/02/2008

I. CALL TO ORDER

Budget Committee Chairman Charles Kimball called the December 8, 2007 meeting of the Fremont Budget Committee and Fremont School Board to order at 8:30 am at the Fremont Town Hall, 295 Main Street, Fremont, NH 03044.

II. ROLL CALL

Present were: Fremont Budget Committee Chairman Charles Kimball, Budget Committee members Patricia Martel, Doug McElroy, Peter Bearse, Don Gates (Selectman), Mike Nygren and Andy Kohlhofer; Fremont School Board Chairman Jeff Rowell, Fremont School Board Vice Chairwoman (and Representative to Fremont Budget Committee) Peg Pinkham, Christine Kenneway, Marian Guidoboni (9:40 am), and Deborah Genthner; Fremont Schools Superintendent Normand Tanguay, Financial Administrator Annmarie Scribner, Middle School Principal Kelli Killen and Elementary School Principal Dawn Lewis. Also in attendance were Sonja Gonsales (Technical Director of Fremont Schools) and Scott Brown (Maintenance Supervisor of Fremont Schools: 9:50 am).

III. FREMONT BUDGET COMMITTEE WORKSESSION: 8:30 am – 9:14 am

Mr. Kimball and Ms. Pinkham noted that today's work session's purpose was to clarify any issues that the Budget Committee collectively had as to the clarity of the Fremont School Budget.

Mr. Nygren asked, on page 4, why the Enrollment line item did not list Fremont Enrollment data for 2007-2008. It was noted to be on the following page and he said that was fine.

Mr. Kohlhofer inquired about the increase of 45 students (from 500 in 2006-07 to 545 currently.) Ms. Pinkham replied that there was an increase in enrollment, but also a decrease in enrollment and that this made for a more "stagnant" enrollment. She said that Ms. Scribner could explain better. She did say that this was covered at a previous School Board meeting and that the thought was that the figures were too high. She mentioned that there would be a jump in high school tuition in the near future as students move up grades. Ms. Pinkham also noted that this year's second grade accounts for 52 students whereas the enrollment was actually in the 60s for second grade last year. She offered that some families moved but that some other students entered the system from families moving to Fremont during the year.

Mr. Nygren said that people have taken children out of school in Fremont but have not moved. Ms. Pinkham said that the schools are doing exit interviews on families who have elected to take children out of Fremont schools (e.g. to enter private schools) in order to understand why.

Mr. McElroy asked if the School Board knows the numbers of students attending private schools. Ms. Pinkham replied that the district is held accountable to provide education for children of Fremont up to age 21.

Mr. Kohlhofer noted that some students are home schooled in Fremont. For these children, Ms. Pinkham clarified that Fremont has accountability as well.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked if the IDEA grant had to do with the Federal Government not meeting reimbursement. Ms. Pinkham said that Ms. Scribner would know more about that but that the grant has exceeded in other years.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked if, under Object on page 18, the Tuition/Regular Education item is just for the high school or for everyone. Ms. Pinkham responded that tuition was only for high school. He noted that Sanborn's budget was going up only 2.5% and he hoped that Sanborn was not raising the tuition. Ms. Pinkham said that Fremont was in a set tuition agreement with Sanborn.

Mr. Bearse asked if the School Board had reports available for grant programs, including things such as performance and products of programs under the titles. Ms. Pinkham replied that there is a financial report but the principals would have more information about the grant programs themselves. She noted that the School Board receives verbal write-ups in the principals' reports as to how grants are going. Ms. Pinkham stated that she did not think it was part of the Budget Committee's function to go into detail about grant programs. Mr. Bearse disagreed and Mr. Kimball also favored having reports from a functional point of view. Mr. Bearse said it was a "take off on accountability."

Mr. Kohlhofer asked why Gifted and Talented and ESL programs were combined in a single line item (with a 18.94% increase in high school tuition.) Ms. Pinkham said that the School Board is working based on projected figures. She further explained that the State is two years behind so that a true reflected tuition cost for this year would be established two years from now. She stated that Fremont was in a contractual agreement with Sanborn and there was a need to pay their projected cost. Mr. Kohlhofer asked if Fremont could see written justification (of their budget) and Ms. Pinkham replied affirmatively, but also said that Fremont does not have the right to argue how Sanborn was doing their projections.

Ms. Pinkham asked if Mr. Bearse would retract his statement that the tuition contract was not legal, as this was a dangerous thing to state in a public forum. Mr. Kimball continued to say that it was voted on a few years ago that the contract would not be discussed anymore. Mr. Bearse did not retract his statement but he did say that he would not bring up the subject again for discussion. Mr. Kohlhofer said that the Budget Committee needed to be able to let the public know why the budget increased. Ms. Pinkham said that it would be simply based on enrollment and tuition increase.

Ms. Pinkham gave history to Ms. Martel about tuition, stating that Fremont has a 20-year contract with Sanborn high school. Ms. Pinkham said that the tuition cost fluctuates based on capital cost (fixed), operational cost (not fixed) and ADM (Average Daily Membership). Ms. Martel asked if it was an annual assessment. Ms. Pinkham replied that every year, Sanborn gives Fremont a projected tuition figure, which is a "true number."

Mr. Bearse asked how the \$13,252 cost per student (p. 21) compared to the actual cost of Sanborn's cost per student. Ms. Pinkham replied that Fremont pays the same cost (as Sanborn.) Ms. Martel noticed that pages 70 and 72 of the budget were identical; Ms. Scribner said that she was aware of that and dispersed new sheets to the Board members to replace the old ones.

Mr. Bearse stated that it was "hard to interpret the increase in tuition without breaking it into components."

BREAK: 9:12 am – 9:14 am

JOINT BOARD MEETING BEGAN 9:14 am; School Board joins Budget Committee

Roll call was taken.

Mr. Kimball stated that there would be intermission breaks every hour unless a discussion could not be interrupted. The Budget Committee gave a consensus vote to do this.

Mr. Tanguay noted that the School District budget was detailed and comprehensive and was level funded in many areas. He did say that it the School Board is not happy to see an increase in high school tuition.

Ms. Pinkham and Mr. Kimball thanked the administration and principals for their early report of budget figures. Mr. Kimball said that if people start budgeting early, it provides a better and more accurate budget. Mr. Tanguay mentioned that the School Board has discussed having a two-year budget, which would be even more beneficial.

Mr. Tanguay began review of the budget, pointing out the School Board Goals.

Ms. Pinkham asked for clarification of the jump to 545 students (2006-07 to 2007-08). Mr. Tanguay replied that it came out of the NESCEC report (long-range study) that projected up to 500 students. The actual was 545. Mr. Tanguay said that the actual number (545) was used in the budget because of the one-year lag and new enrollment of kindergarten students. Ms. Pinkham asked if this could be reflected in the budget.

Mr. Tanguay reported that the School Board approved the School District Organizational Chart. Mr. Kohlhofer asked if Title 1 and ESOL responsibility was given to Ms. Lewis and Ms. Lewis replied affirmatively.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked what Catastrophic Aid was; Mr. Tanguay replied that it meant Special Education.

Mr. Tanguay said that State grants were presently under review.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked if the Unreserved Fund Balance meant “surplus” and Mr. Tanguay replied that it was money left over from last year. Mr. Kohlhofer wondered if perhaps the School Board over-projected last year.

Mr. Tanguay said that money is covered when making projections and that some districts have warrant articles on energy costs. He said that the School district was trying to be honest with how things are being done. Actual expenditure amounts are being worked on now. Ms. Pinkham clarified that projections are only through June 2008. Mr. Tanguay said that projections are necessary in order to know how to spend accounts.

Ms. Pinkham also stated that it is important to scrutinize projections to be sure no over-projecting occurs.

Mr. Tanguay noted that the budget changes almost daily and priorities could change to meet needs: the budget is an “ongoing instrument” and spending might not happen the way it is projected.

**** Q: WHERE DID MONEY FOR THE NEW SAU OFFICE AND \$45,000 FOR KINDERGARTEN TRANSPORTATION COME FROM?**

Mr. Bearse asked if Mr. Tanguay, with the Board's cooperation, could present a specification as to how to deal with contingency/change in the budget so it is transparent to the Budget Committee (can the School Board give the Budget Committee warning when changes occur throughout the year).

Mr. Kohlhofer inquired about IDEA and Title I grants. Mr. Tanguay responded that the school district could only spend what the grants give and that Title I can be over- or under-funded (it changes) but is level-funded now. Mr. Tanguay said that Mr. Kohlhofer was correct in thinking that Title I is based on the number of students in the free lunch program.

Regarding the Salaries line item, Mr. Kohlhofer mentioned that people would want to know what positions are planning on being cut in order to vote on the budget. Mr. Tanguay said that time would be needed to alert staff members. Mr. Kimball said that this would be necessary for the final vote on the budget but not for today's meeting. Ms. Martel asked if benefits were included (in salaries) and Mr. Tanguay said they were included. Mr. McElroy asked if knowing the exact positions was a budgetary need and Ms. Pinkham replied that names are not necessary to be reported, just the positions. She asked the Budget Committee to leave the cuts/recommendations solely on the administration since job cuts might not be completed before February 2008. She further stated that the Fremont School District was not happy with the job cuts because they would bring more work to the remaining staff. She said that "preemptive decisions" were being made.

Ms. Pinkham got a general consensus from the Budget Committee that the School Board would only report the amount of job cuts in certain areas such as general education or special education.

Mr. Nygren asked if the district was still looking to fill the Speech position. Mr. Tanguay replied that if someone could be hired and that it would cost the district less money, the position would certainly be filled.

Mr. Tanguay stated that the General Substitute line item was under-budgeted and that the savings could be offset. Mr. Nygren asked what the accepted absence rate was. Mr. Tanguay said that it was approximately 5-7 days in the private sector and that is the district's target. Mr. Kohlhofer noted that the attendance rate of the administration is even higher (than regular staff) and Mr. Tanguay said that that was being reviewed. Ms. Scribner explained that, in the past, line transfers were done so that no line had a negative number and money was put somewhere else. Fremont keeps all numbers and is dictated by collaborative bargaining agreements. Ms. Scribner said that substitutes make \$70/day.

Mr. Kohlhofer noted that the % increase on pages 18 and 19 differed. Ms. Scribner would look at that.

Mr. Kimball asked if After School Tutors were new. Ms. Scribner replied that last year they were under Extracurricular but was moved to 1100 General Education this year. Mr. Kohlhofer asked if this was outside of Special Education tutoring and Ms. Scribner said it was.

Mr. Bearse suggested that staff reductions be broken into components such as new hires, lower cost, cost of living, etc. Ms. Pinkham said that new hires were not figured in that; the figure was only for staff reductions.

Ms. Scribner reported that health insurance dropped this year but dental went up 2.6%. Life insurance and teacher retirement stayed level.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked if the after school tutors were requirements of No Child Left Behind. Ms. Killen responded that they were parts of the Regular Education for students who need supports but who are not considered Special Education. Mr. Kohlhofer asked if there was an RSA attached and Ms. Killen said she would check on that. Ms. Lewis did say that it was tied to No Child Left Behind.

Mr. Bearse wondered why the tutor line was so low. Ms. Killen replied that there was one tutor for the elementary level and one for the middle school level. Tutors work 2 hours/day for 4 days/week. Standardized test scores and assessments are used to determine the students' greatest needs. Those students work with tutors and then are reassessed.

Mr. Bearse asked how many students receive tutoring. Ms. Lewis said that there were 5 students receiving tutoring in the elementary school and none at the middle school now. Answering Ms. Pinkham, Ms. Lewis said that there were enough tutors projected.

Mr. Nygren inquired about the perfect attendance buyback. Mr. Tanguay responded that it was part of collective bargaining agreements that are ongoing. Ms. Pinkham furthered that it was an incentive for retirement-age staff to consider leaving their positions.

Ms. Scribner said that there was no change in teachers' retirement. Mr. Kohlhofer asked if unemployment insurance was in anticipation of layoffs. Ms. Scribner said that the district pays up to \$8,000 of everyone's salary if laid off or not.

Ms. Martel asked what the ratio of employee contribution to health insurance was and Mr. Tanguay replied that it was 89% for teachers and that it varied by position. It was in negotiations for next year. Mr. Nygren asked if the last contract was agreed upon last year and Ms. Scribner said that it was.

Mr. Nygren asked if Sanborn's tuition figure was a realistic projection and Mr. Tanguay responded that he had requested figures from Sanborn. Mr. Tanguay said that Fremont could have a separate warrant article for the increase, which would protect Fremont schools. If the money were not needed, Fremont wouldn't be able to touch it. The monies would be "restricted, protected funds." Ms. Pinkham felt that this was important to assure the Budget Committee and the public that the School Board has tried to hold true to budgeting.

One risk involved in putting the tuition increase in a warrant article would be a force into deficit budget. Mr. Kimball suggested that the School Board check out the idea. Ms. Pinkham said that the voting sequence would need to be changed when presented to voters. The Budget Committee would need to understand that if the warrant article failed, the School Board would have to change the budget on the floor.

Regarding Supplies, Mr. Nygren suspected that there should be an increase from lower to upper grades since children learn more, as they get older. Ms. Killen said that it is actually based on classrooms; each teacher gets \$1000/year for supplies. Unified Arts teachers spend as needed. Ms. Killen noted that the Special Education basic supplies line was moved to the 1200 supply line.

Mr. Bearse brought up the notion some people have that schools do not have enough supplies and wondered if Fremont fell suit. Ms. Killen said that Fremont Schools have a sufficient amount of supplies.

Mr. Kohlhofer inquired about standardized tests. Ms. Killen explained that the state exam is called the NECAP (taken in October with results in January) and the federal exam is the NWEA (computerized test with results in 24 hrs.) With the NWEA, there are projections as to where children should grow by a certain percentage. After school tutoring and summer school can help

children gain better knowledge. Mr. Kohlhofer asked if Sanborn high school also did this. Ms. Killen said that it does and that tests do show progression all through high school. Mr. Kohlhofer clarified with Ms. Killen that this is for the schools' own information, not for No Child Left Behind.

Mr. Kimball wondered why it was necessary to take the NECAP if the NWEA was provided better information sooner. Ms. Killen said that the NWEA test was not "better", just "different" and that NECAP testing does give valuable information also.

Mr. Rowell mentioned that a progress reporting system was adopted which ties with GLEs and provides data throughout the year.

Ms. Pinkham mentioned that she would get a few copies of the new pilot-reporting program to the Budget Committee and noted that the forum held this week went well, including a consultant who spoke about accountability and how children learn differently. She said that these forums would help parents understand the proposed, more detailed reporting program.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked what the \$5,000 materials fee covered. Ms. Killen said that the district pays per student, depending on how many tests are taken (NEWA): one pack including reading, math and language arts and a second pack including science. This year, k-2 testing was added and Ms. Lewis explained that the test is read to (kindergarten) students. Ms. Killen said that this year all testing was put under one line item. Included in the testing price is a "reporting suite," training for staff and administration and teacher resources.

Mr. Bearse asked for clarification of the \$500 given to each class for textbooks/curriculum material. Ms. Killen explained that the district no longer buys multiple copies of textbooks per child. Instead, texts are purchased as resources in classrooms. She said that textbook series could cost \$10,000 - \$15,000. An exception is the Everyday Math Program where the cost is split. There is a discount on purchases that are reordered each year.

Mr. Bearse asked why he didn't see an allocation for science and Ms. Pinkham noted that it was reflected on p. 24. Ms. Killen said that some comes out of the textbook line. He also asked what "math manipulatives" were and Ms. Killen replied that they were items such as blocks, which help with math skills.

In answering Mr. Kohlhofer, Ms. Killen said that the new furniture line was kept open by placing \$1 in it. Mr. Kimball wondered why the furniture was placed in different categories and suggested that they be under one "furniture replacement" line item. Mr. Tanguay agreed that that would be helpful.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked what new computer equipment was to be purchased and Ms. Pinkham noted that this line item was very heavily cut and apologized to Ms. Gonsales for that. Ms. Killen said that new equipment would include thin clients/terminals, which would save space and energy use.

Ms. Pinkham noted that the teachers' laptops would be coming off of the 4-year warranty. There was a cut of about \$30,000 from the budget for the technology line but she said that the Budget Committee could put funds back if they deemed it necessary.

Mr. Bearse mentioned the need to keep up with technology on behalf of the students. Ms. Gonsales said that older laptops could still be used in the classrooms. Ms. Killen stated the importance of well-functioning laptops as actual teaching tools for teachers. She said they should be upgraded after 4 or 5 years.

Mr. Bearse inquired how many video cams were in the school to help with classroom teaching. Ms. Gonsales said that there were over 5 various types of camcorders/digital cameras. She answered Mr.

McElroy's question about laptop cost by stating that they cost approximately \$800/laptop plus the cost of licenses, antivirus software, etc. (totaling around \$12,000/laptop for 15 staff laptops.) \$1400 would be the cost to replace aged printers and \$4,000 would be necessary for the server.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked about professional dues. Ms. Killen said that they (and institutional dues) are contractual.

BREAK: 10:47 – 11:00 am

Ms. Pinkham noted that line item 2600 dropped 0.26% and mentioned that there has been energy savings from the energy efficient equipment in the buildings (and changing lights and ballasts.)

Mr. Brown noted that consumption was less even though energy costs have been increasing. The fuel cost was locked in. He said that his responsibility was to not ask for more in the budget.

Mr. Brown answered a question from Mr. Kohlhofer, saying that there was no asbestos in the building and that it was just inspected in August 2007.

Mr. Brown said that the line item 2600 does cover the cost of inspection of the kitchen fire system.

Mr. Bearse asked if there were other opportunities to save money and Mr. Brown replied that he was looking into motors that run constantly for heat pumps and HVAC systems. It was recommended that when a motor is changed out, that a new energy efficient motor be put in place to lower overall cost and energy use.

Mr. McElroy inquired about the new custodial furniture (p. 80). Mr. Brown clarified that furniture requests would go through him and he would check inventory and that sometimes "replacing furniture" was directed to him too. Then, Ms. Killen said that she then would help determine what was in the budget for potential purchasing. Mr. Brown said that he knows someone in the used furniture business, which has been a good resource to save money.

Mr. Bearse asked about heating oil. Mr. Brown said that fuel was stored in a tank (dated 1989) underground. Mr. McElroy asked if it needed to be dug up after 25 years and Mr. Brown said that he would check on that.

Mr. Nygren wondered if the furniture could be put in one line item for accounting purposes. Ms. Pinkham said that Mr. Tanguay would give a master view of this. Mr. Bearse noted that, in the future, every public building might need to account for its carbon footprint.

Ms. Lewis stated that Special Education was district wide and accounts for children ages 3 to 21. She said that the Special Education budget was based on individual student needs that changed throughout the year. As such, the totals were her best guess based on anticipated needs.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked what RTI Services were and Ms. Lewis replied that RTI (Response to Intervention) was mandated in 1997 for pre-referral services and has been refined. RTI provides regular education services for students who need supports and who are not Special Education-identified. She said that literacy coaches are a part of RTI. Mr. Bearse asked about the cut of \$5,000 from the tutoring line even though it was a preventative service. Ms. Lewis responded that she looked at the number of children testing in a certain range. She said that sometimes children couldn't stay after school to get tutoring because parents cannot provide transportation.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked if there were study halls. Ms. Killen said that, in the middle school, there was a time period at the end of the day where small groups of students can meet with the teacher to get extra help or start homework, but time is structured differently at the elementary school, Ms. Lewis said.

Mr. Bearse asked about the two new positions in the salary category. Ms. Lewis stated that they were for para educators for two students entering kindergarten next year (one on one). She said that there were currently 17 para educators.

Ms. Scribner mentioned that she had made a mistake using the ADS system last year, which resulted in an error of \$92,000. This money was returned in the revenue line.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked about the teacher salary increasing by around 20% (\$56,000). Ms. Scribner attributed that to putting Gifted and Talented there, though it is not Special Education. Mr. Nygren felt that it should be separated in the budget. Ms. Scribner noted that it was on a separate page.

Regarding FICA, Mr. Kohlhofer asked if the district paid into the pension plan instead and Ms. Scribner said that it was social security and Medicaid and was in the 5220 line. She said that life insurance was supplied to teachers and was contractual. Mr. Kohlhofer noted that there should be a number to reflect that where it showed "0" and Ms. Scribner agreed.

Mr. Nygren asked if Tutor Contracted Services was anticipated and Ms. Lewis said yes, that she knew based on current needs.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked why one would pay for a child to attend school in another district and Ms. Lewis replied that this might happen for instance in foster care situations. Ms. Martel asked why the NH Public Elementary Tuition line item decreased. Based on student needs, Ms. Lewis was not anticipating any such needs with incoming kindergarteners.

Mr. Kohlhofer said that he thought there was going to be a resource room when the school addition was built. Ms. Lewis said that Fremont was certified to have one but that a resource room was not necessary and moreover, additional staff would be needed.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked if parents can dispute IEPs and Ms. Lewis said that that was possible but that it hadn't been done in a while. Ms. Lewis said that Fremont has not placed children in residential programs and that a court would have to request that.

Mr. Nygren asked if reimbursement could come from Medicare and Ms. Lewis said that it could if medically based.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked about periodicals and Ms. Lewis said that they provide important information. He asked if any were available online but Ms. Lewis replied that teachers preferred having printed journals which are more handy and can be read anywhere. Mr. Kohlhofer suggested that they could be printed off of the internet but Ms. Lewis felt that teachers would not access information from journals from the internet as well as they did with the paper ones.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked if "computer software" included maintenance and troubleshooting. Ms. Lewis said that it is unique to student needs and that Ms. Gonsales helped with troubleshooting. Ms. Lewis explained that new Special Education computer equipment was tied to student needs as "adaptive equipment."

Ms. Kohlhofer inquired about the idea of scanning information onto discs for storage. Ms. Lewis said that it would take a lot of time, and accuracy was important. Ms. Pinkham said that the subject was already brought up at a School Board meeting. Kohlhofer asked if there was voice activated software but Ms. Lewis said that there has not been a need for it.

Mr. Bearse asked what the difference was between Speech/Language Impairment and Specific Learning Disability. Ms. Lewis said that usually younger students experience Speech/Language Impairment and as they got older, the language component might go away and more of a learning disability might be defined.

Mr. Kohlhofer inquired about mental retardation and Ms. Lewis explained that it had different criteria than developmental delay, an identification that could be used up to age 8 1/2. She noted that Autism was unique and that each disability had specific criteria. She clarified that 86 students were listed as receiving Special Education whereas 125 students in the whole district (including high school) receive services. Mr. Kohlhofer said that it made 16% of children (in Fremont's school system) who received Special Education services.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked if there were regulations as to how many case managers there could be. Ms. Lewis said that there were no regulations and that the number was based on student needs. She said that case managers and supervisors work as a team.

Mr. Nygren wondered if Fremont Schools were getting the services for which they were paying at Sanborn. Ms. Lewis said that Fremont knew Sanborn's staff better now and she was happy with the services at Sanborn. Ms. Lewis confirmed that contracted services paid to Sanborn center around tutoring, which is not in the tuition agreement. Mr. Tanguay said that this was identified in the contract that was signed by both districts.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked if Special Education regulation required a case manager and Ms. Lewis said that a case manager was necessary as a system to run Special Education.

Mr. Bearse wondered why a young person would receive occupational therapy. Ms. Lewis explained that some children might have issues with upper body, fine motor, or sensory integration systems (due to abnormal development.) Ms. Pinkham noted that a child's "occupation" was to learn, therefore, the district would need to provide skill sets in the point of view of occupation.

In Gifted and Talented, Ms. Lewis stated that 80-90% of students were in the "talent pool"; 10% needed expansion activities and 2-8% had individual learning plans. She said that children were identified as Gifted and Talented in almost each classroom.

Mr. Nygren wondered if one person was sufficient to do both Gifted and Talented teaching and administration and Ms. Lewis said that this person was well qualified in both areas. She explained that this person helps work with Gifted and Talented children so that the classroom teacher can conduct the class for the rest of the students.

Mr. Kohlhofer asked if there was access to virtual programming for Gifted and Talented students and Ms. Lewis said that parents could access it at home. Ms. Lewis clarified that just IQ could not be used to identify Gifted and Talented students. Mr. Bearse suggested that parents be brought into the Gifted and Talented program to help.

Mr. Kohlhofer expressed concern about the increases in (Gifted and Talented). Ms. Pinkham noted that many resources were spent on Special Education because of law dictation. She said also that voters favor all students to have educational programs. Mr. Bearse said that he agreed though he

supported that program, he felt that it was important to know the criteria of the Gifted and Talented program.

Mr. Kimball said that, as a taxpayer, it was only necessary to provide a general education and that if a child was gifted, it was up to his/her parents to work with him/her. Mr. Bearse disagreed.

Mr. Tanguay suggested having a second reading of the budget in light of the time and it was decided by both Boards to meet on January 5, 2008 at 9 am. An interim meeting would be held, possibly on December 19, 2007, with Ms. Lewis since she would not be at the January 5 meeting. The Budget Committee would confirm this this week.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Kohlhofer made a motion to adjourn at 12:40 pm. Mr. Nygren seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Perry
School Board Secretary